



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/526,978	03/15/2000	Sean Nolan	004444.P001	9734

7590 11/18/2004

Paul A Mendonsa
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/526,978	NOLAN, SEAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Khanh Dinh	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-11,13,14,21-24,26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-11,13,14,21-24,26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Request for Continued Examination and the Preliminary Amendment filed on 10/7/2004. Claims 5, 12 and 25 are further cancelled. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14, 21-24, 26 and 27 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14, 21-24, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Jain, U.S. pat. No.6,480,853 in view of Kirsch, US pat. No.5,963,915 and further in view of Braden-Harder et al., US pat. No.5,933,822.

As to claim 1, Jain discloses a method comprising:

storing data on a server (26 fig.2) coupled to receive requests from client devices (24 fig.2) and generating a set of one or more common search requests from subsets of the product data (see abstract, fig.2, col.4 lines 1-42).

Art Unit: 2151

performing the set of common search requests to identify one or more products (locate user's requests), storing on the server an indication of one or more products as a result of performing of common search requests (see col.6 lines 4-64).

receiving a subsequent search request from a client device (24 fig.2), determining whether the subsequent search request is one of the common search requests and providing results without performing the subsequent search request if the subsequent search request is one of the common search requests (i.e., using search engine to receive requests from client devices and find a particular interest and returning the corresponding Web pages, see figs. 4, 5, col.5 line 5 to col.6 line 64 and col.7 lines 7-44).

Jain does not specifically disclose designation of a search request as a common search request, determining whether the subsequent search request is one of the common search requests and providing results from the stored results without performing the subsequent search request and performing the subsequent search request if the subsequent search request is not equivalent to one of the previously performed common search requests. However, Kirsch discloses designation of a search request as a common search request, determining whether a subsequent search request is equivalent to one of common search requests [using the server (5 fig.2) to request relevant information from each source server to identify a source of the requested product or service at the best price and availability within parameters, see abstract, col.10 line 31 to col.11 line 15], then providing results from the stored results without performing the subsequent search request (providing a selection in response to the

Art Unit: 2151

client user selection, see col.11 lines 4-45 and col.col.12 lines 10-54) and performing the subsequent search request if the subsequent search request is not equivalent to one of the previously performed common search requests (see fig.3, col.11 lines 16-62 and col.12 line 40 to col.13 line 45). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Kirsch's teachings into the computer system of Jain to perform a purchase transaction over the Internet because it would have performed efficiently secure purchase transactions and maintained security over the transaction without requiring user authentication manually entered by a client user over the Internet (see col.4 line 44 to col.5 line 21).

Neither Jain nor Kirsch specifically discloses the step of based on the frequency of previously search requests. However, Braden-Harder discloses the step of based on the frequency of previously search requests (using conventional keyword search engine to calculate document's statistics including frequency of each matching word, see Braden-Harder 's fig.2, col.2 line 34 to col.3 line 6 and col.8 line 30 to col.9 line 43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Braden-Harder's teaching into the computer system method of Jain to retrieve stored record of web documents into a dataset from World Wide Web because it would have enabled users to filter and to re-rank documents that are more relevant to a user-supplied query on the World Wide Web using a search engine (see Braden-Harder's col.7 lines 6-33).

Art Unit: 2151

As to claim 2, Jain discloses all requests from a particular user during a session are directed to the server (see col.5 line 5 to col.6 line 64).

As to claim 3, Jain discloses all requests that occur between a first request of the session and a predetermined period of time during which no request is received by the server (see col.6 line 4 to col.7 line 36).

As to claim 4, Jain discloses the data and information related to the session are maintained in volatile memory of the server (see col.4 line 21 to col.5 line 44).

As to claims 6 and 7, Jain discloses one or more searches for a category of information relating to various products and information for use with an electronic commerce World Wide Web site (searches URLs or web pages related to products of cellular telephones, see fig.3, col.5 line 19 to col.6 line 64).

Claims 8-11, 13 and 14 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1-4, 6 and 7 respectively.

Claims 21-24, 26 and 27 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1-4, 6 and 7 respectively.

Other prior art cited

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Kawasaki et al, US pat. No.6,282,543.
- b. DeRose et al, US pat. No.6,101,543.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14, 21-24, 26 and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14, 21-24, 26 and 27 are ***rejected***.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Application/Control Number: 09/526,978

Page 7

Art Unit: 2151

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Khanh'.

Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2151
11/14/2004